## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jabbar J. Straws, #231018,		) C/A No. 5:11-132-TMC-KDW
P	laintiff,	)
		)
v.		)
		) ORDER
Sergeant Roach; Bruce Oberman; Nurse Pract;		)
Doctor Pate; Nurse Practitioner Susan Blake;		)
Nurse Boyd; Nurse Singlee; Nurse Johnson; C.		)
James; D. Patterson;		)
		)
	Defendants.	)
		)

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant Susan Blake filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on August 8, 2012. ECF No. 113. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on August 9, 2012, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of a motion for summary judgment and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 114. Plaintiff was informed that his response was due by September 13, 2012, and was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendant Blake's motion may be granted, thereby ending his case against Defendant Blake.

Notwithstanding the specific warning and instructions set forth in the court's *Roseboro* order, Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon his action against Defendant Blake. Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff is directed to advise the court whether he wishes to continue with this case and to file a response to Defendant Blake's Motion for Summary Judgment by **October 8, 2012**. Plaintiff is further advised that if he fails to respond, this action against Defendant Blake will be

recommended for dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

September 20, 2012 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West United States Magistrate Judge

Haymai D. Hest